

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 19-1796C

(E-filed: December 11, 2019)

---

AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC., )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )  
THE UNITED STATES, )  
Defendant, )  
and )  
MICROSOFT CORP., )  
Intervenor-defendant. )

---

## ORDER

On December 10, 2019, defendant filed a document titled “Notice of Objection to Certain Material Designated as Protected,” ECF No. 50. Therein, defendant asks that the court “reject [plaintiff’s] overbroad redactions and direct that AWS refile a redacted version of its complaint redacting only material properly warranting protection, as reflected in the proposed redacted version that we file separately under seal.” *Id.* at 6. Although it is not presented in precisely these terms, it appears to the court that defendant would like the court to strike plaintiff’s redacted complaint, ECF No. 26, and direct the filing of defendant’s version of the redacted complaint, ECF No. 51. In order to seek such relief, defendant must do so by motion rather than by notice to ensure that the issues are be fully briefed—allowing a response and a reply pursuant to the court’s rules—for the court’s consideration.

Accordingly, the clerk’s office is directed to **STRIKE** defendant’s **notice** of objection, ECF No. 50, and its proposed redacted complaint, ECF No. 51. Defendant may refile its request as a properly docketed motion if it decides to pursue the relief articulated in its notice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Patricia E. Campbell-Smith  
PATRICIA E. CAMPBELL-SMITH  
Judge